

Date: Sun, 23 Oct 94 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Digital Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-digital@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Digital-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Digital Digest V94 #349
To: Ham-Digital

Ham-Digital Digest Sun, 23 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 349

Today's Topics:

book wanted: Digital LOS radio links
NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins (3 msgs)
Send .COM files over e-mail
Source for KA9Q Nos

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Digital@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Digital-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Digital Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-digital".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Oct 1994 15:54:07 -0400
From: eschuppe@enterprise.america.com (Ernst Schuppe)
Subject: book wanted: Digital LOS radio links

does anyone have a copy of Townsends book Digital Line of Sight Radio
Links they would care to sell?

Feel free to respond via email.

thanks in advance
ernst

Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 09:44:18 UNDEFINED
From: kevin.jessup@meipws.mis.mei.com (Kevin Jessup)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com> rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)

writes:

K7WWA (NOT Bob Wilkins, above) writes...

>From : K7WWA@K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM
>To : INFO@ALLUS

...stuff deleted...

> we requested FCC clarification regarding
>the definition of "One-Way Bulletins" and "Bulletin Message Content"
>as it specifically applied to Amateur Packet Radio. The position of
>the FCC is as follows:

>3. The Information sent MUST BE RELATED TO, AND OF INTEREST TO
>AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS ONLY!

>

>4. Any Packet Bulletin which contains material which relates to
>anything not directly related to amateur radio, or of interest to
>amateur radio operators only, is considered to be "Broadcasting."
>This includes material on Cars, Guns, Politics, Food, Jokes,
>Current Events, etc. etc. etc.

>

>In the above listing the emphasis was supplied by the FCC in the
>letter I have on file.

>73, keep up the good work! Fred Sober, AB6GQ

Now I THINK it was Bob (N6FRI), who replied with this...

>>*** Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all
>>*** that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.

A BIG QSL on the "boring" aspect, OM!

My OPINION is that the message "content" is just as important (if not
more so) as the method by which the data is transferred. I LOVE the
freedom of the Internet.

I have enough of a problem trying to keep my interest in advancing the
amateur radio sota (via cooperative investment in packet infrastructure,
TCPIP/NOS, SS, etc) alive here in Wisconsin what with the total lack of
interest by the vast majority of the AX.25 1200 baud beacon fanatics
around here. Most just don't care about cooperative INVESTMENT (yes,
this takes \$\$\$) in a high-speed backbone.

Now lets make that investment even LESS attractive by LIMITING the type of traffic to that typical, BORING amateur blather about the weather and your current health problems. I swear the FCC WANTS us to die! They'll then have even more spectrum to auction off.

There is a difference between BROADCASTING and POSTING AN ARTICLE so as to encourage intelligent discussion. While SOME packet posts are in poor taste (and approach broadcasting), many result in interesting discussion threads (and yes, a few flame wars).

BIG NEWS: people have different opinions on almost every topic. One of the advantages of living in a "free" country is the exchange of those ideas in an open manor.

Commercial telecomm looks better and better every day. Then again, I'm sure we'll see Internet regulated and censored soon enough.

Maybe those in rec.radio,pirate are right! ;-)

```
/`_-      kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com  |
{     }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc  | SS RF: "License? We don't
\     / Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA   | need no stinkin' license!"
|__*| N9SQB@n9pbv.en63ff.wi.usa.na |
```

Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 20:06:26 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULletins

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>This was found floating on the Amateur Packet BBS system. What do you think?

I think it's always in the benefit of the ARS when a clarification of the rules are made in advance to violation notices being handed out. All it probably took was for a few to stretch what was considered appropriate use of packet for this clarification to be made.

On the back of our license it says, in part, 'Operation of the station shall be in accordance with Part 97 of the Commission's Rules.' Our signature on the front binds us to this statement.

If someone has a problem with this OO and this clarification, I hear

that packet might now be in use on the CB frequencies....

>*** Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all
>*** that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.
>*** 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

Boring maybe, but legal!

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Sat, 22 Oct 1994 20:47:19 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: NoCal OO goes after Packet BULletins

kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com (Kevin Jessup) writes:

> Then again,
>I'm sure we'll see Internet regulated and censored soon enough.

Our worst nightmare: The US Postal Service to run internet; 29 cents per article per recipient! This one message might ``...cost hundreds if not thousands of dollars to post to every machine ...'' [that'll sound familiar to UNIX users].

73 from Hawaii,
Jeff NH6IL

Date: 23 Oct 94 04:15:08 GMT
From: ka1kjz@tigger.jvnc.NET (Ron Barnes)
Subject: Send .COM files over e-mail

hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson) wrote:

>So point us to this standard.
>
>I've seen several references to it, but no reference to where
>one might actually GET the standard, nor any reference to
>WHICH standard body publishes it.
>
>--- FLAME ON!
>
>Or is that just you "professionals" trying to keep us "amateurs"
>in the dark about what is happening in the "professional" world?

>
>--- FLAME OFF!

OH C'MON! I would think THE WORLD could do better than a message like that,
have you ever heard of an RFC?????????

Took a look thru the RFC index, a grand total of 2 minutes work and here are
the references I have found...

1344 Implications of MIME for Internet Mail Gateways. N. Borenstein.
June 1992. (Format: TXT=25872, PS=51812 bytes)

1428 Transition of Internet Mail from Just-Send-8 to 8bit-SMTP/MIME.
G. Vaudreuil. February 1993. (Format: TXT=12064 bytes)

1521 MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) Part One: Mechanisms
for Specifying and Describing the Format of Internet Message Bodies.
N. Borenstein & N. Freed. September 1993. (Format: TXT=187424,
PS=393670 bytes) (Obsoletes RFC 1341)

1522 MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) Part Two: Message
Header Extensions for Non-ASCII Text. K. Moore. September 1993.
(Format: TXT=22502 bytes) (Obsoletes RFC 1342)

1556 Handling of Bi-directional Texts in MIME. H. Nussbacher. December
1993. (Format: TXT=5602 bytes)

1563 The text/enriched MIME Content-type. N. Borenstein. January 1994.
(Format: TXT=32913, PS=73543 bytes) (Obsoletes RFC 1523)

1641 Using Unicode with MIME. D. Goldsmith & M. Davis. July 1994.
(Format: TXT=11258 bytes)

1652 SMTP Service Extension for 8bit-MIMEtransport. Klensin, N. Freed,
M. Rose, E. Stefferud & D. Crocker. July 1994. (Format: TXT=11842
bytes) (Obsoletes RFC1426)

Oh but wait, we are Amateurs... we have to wait until The Almighty League
(tm) publishes it before it's legal to use. Where are the donuts?

--

** Ronald C. Barnes - KA1KJZ Broadcast Engineer, WTXX-TV

**

** ARRL CT Section Technical

Specialist **

** internet: ka1kjz@tigger.jvnc.net Member, Society of Broadcast

Engineers **
** packet : ka1kjj@n4gaa.ct.usa.na Member, IEEE
**
**
**
** This message has been brought to you by...
**
** Ouchies, the prickly toy you bathe with
**

Date: 22 Oct 94 06:35:17 CDT
From: jwl@walter.UCSD.EDU (James W. Lynch)
Subject: Source for KA9Q Nos

Bill Vaughn (billv@olympus.net) wrote:
: I need a source for ka9q nos . hereford org only has it in tar.z. I would like
: to get it in a zip file or some such. Any help would be appreciated.

The tar.z format is a gzip'ed tar file. Get gzip from SimTel. If you
don't have a MSDOS tar, then get that from SimTel too. That is, if
you can't find your zip'ed version.

Jim.
--

Jim Lynch, Sales Analyst, Cray Research, Inc. / ARS: K4GVO
Southeast District, Phone: (404) 631-2254, Email: jwl@cray.com
Suite 270, 200 Westpark Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

End of Ham-Digital Digest V94 #349
